DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 993 24 RC 009 588

TITLE The Indian Education Act of 1972. Report of Progress for the Third Year of the Program.
INSTITUTION Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Indian Education.
REPORT NO DHEW-OE-76-02401
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 49p.; For related documents, see ED 107 439, ED 107 446

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *American Indians; *Annual Reports; Community Involvement; *Delivery Systems; *Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Recruitment; Federal Government; Federal Legislation; Information Dissemination; Performance Criteria; *Program Evaluation; Tables (Data); Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS *National Indian Education Act 1972

ABSTRACT

Program implementation under the American Indian Education Act of 1972 (IEA) is evaluated in this 1975 progress report via narrative and tabular data. Presenting an executive summary and reviews of the first and second years of progress, this third year evaluation focuses upon: the extent to which Indian children have received IEA services; IEA services addressed to the special educational needs of participating Indian children; the effects of IEA services on Indian children; performance objectives associated with IEA programs; effectiveness of the planning/evaluation process; effects of the Federal delivery system; and changes in pupil achievement. Major third-year recommendations are presented as follows: develop and implement a service and dissemination network to implement the findings of pilot, planning, and demonstration projects in the school; continue recruitment, training, and placement of Indian teachers/administrators; consider extending the potential benefits of the Act to Indian children and youth not now reached; develop a management reporting system to insure Indian community participation in local education agency projects; develop a national needs assessment to identify Indian educational needs as influenced by the total environment; develop and implement more extensive delivery of technical assistance at all levels of IEA projects. (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131993

THE INDIAN EDUCATION ACT OF 1972



4 NOV 1976
ERIC/CIJE
RECEIVED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REPORT OF PROGRESS FOR THE THIRD YEAR OF THE PROGRAM



RC009588

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED. – No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

Cover illustration by
JOE MARTIN
Navajo Tribe

HEW Publication No. (OE) 76-02401

THE INDIAN EDUCATION ACT OF 1972

REPORT OF PROGRESS

FOR THE THIRD YEAR OF THE PROGRAM

Prepared by
Office of Indian Education
U. S. Office of Education

March 1976

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
David Mathews, *Secretary*
Virginia Y. Trotter, *Assistant Secretary for Education*
Office of Education
T. H. Bell, *Commissioner*

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1976

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $1

CONTENTS

Section		*Page*
I	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I-1
	1.0 OVERVIEW	I-1
	2.0 CONCLUSIONS	I-2
	3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	I-4
II	REVIEW OF FIRST AND SECOND YEARS OF PROGRESS	II-1
	1.0 INTRODUCTION	II-1
	2.0 SUMMARY OF REPORT ON FIRST YEAR OF PROGRESS	II-1
	2.1 Overview	II-1
	2.2 Restatement of Fiscal Year 1973 Recommendations	II-2
	2.3 Actions Taken on Fiscal Year 1973 Recommendations	II-3
	3.0 SUMMARY OF REPORT ON SECOND YEAR OF PROGRESS	II-3
	3.1 Overview	II-3
	3.2 Major Conclusions	II-4
	3.3 Recommended Administrative Actions	II-4
	3.4 Actions Taken on Fiscal Year 1974 Recommendations	II-5
III	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	III-1
	1.0 INTRODUCTION	III-1
	2.0 MAJOR ISSUES	III-1
	2.1 To What Extent Have Indian Children Received IEA Services?	III-1
	2.1.1 Project Funding	III-1
	2.1.2 Participant Characteristics	III-3
	2.1.3 Parent Committee and Community-at-Large Involvement in IEA Programs – Part A	III-7
	2.1.4 Eligibility of Schools and Students – Part A	III-9
	2.1.5 Community Involvement in IEA Programs – Part B	III-10
	2.1.6 Eligibility of Students – Part B	III-11
	2.2 Are IEA Services Addressed to the Special Educational Needs of Participating Indian Children?	III-12
	2.2.1 What is the Relationship Between Assessed Needs and IEA Program Objectives?	III-12
	2.2.2 What Types of Programs are Provided for Special Projects (Part B)?	III-17
	2.3 What Effects are Associated With IEA Services for Indian Children?	III-19
	2.4 What Kinds of Performance Objectives are Associated With IEA Programs?	III-20
	2.5 How Effective is the Planning and Evaluation Process?	III-22
	2.6 What Effects are Associated With the Federal Delivery System?	III-24
	2.6.1 To What Extent Were Applications Denied?	III-24
	2.6.2 What Changes Have Occurred in Funding?	III-25
	2.7 What Changes Have Occurred in Pupil Achievement?	III-26

TABLES

Table		*Page*
1	Comparative Overview Budget Summary Title IV IEA Program	III-2
2	Comparable Analysis of Part A Projects	III-4
3	Ethnic Characteristics of Part A Funded Districts Based on Field Study Data	III-6
4	Special Target Groups Within Part A Funded Districts Based on Field Study Data	III-6
5	Select Characteristics of Pupils From Part A Funded Districts Based on Field Study Data	III-7
6	Parent Committee Involvement in Planning IEA Programs – Part A	III-8
7	Parent Committee Involvement in the Operation of the IEA Programs – Part A	III-8
8	Community-at-Large Involvement in IEA Programs – Part A	III-8
9	Determination of Pupil Eligibility – Part A (Field Study Data)	III-9
10	Local Community Involvement in IEA Programs – Part B	III-10
11	Local Community Involvement in Evaluating IEA Programs – Part B	III-10
12	Determination of Pupil Eligibility – Part B	III-11
13	Basis for Determining Pupil Eligibility – Part B	III-12
14	Percentages of Funded Project Applications Reflecting Specific Needs FY 73, FY 74, and FY 75	III-13
15	Percent of Funded Project Applications Reflecting Specific Objectives FY 73, FY 74, and FY 75	III-15
16	Relationship of Curriculum Objectives to Curriculum Needs	III-17
17	Types of IEA Projects (Part B), FY 74/FY 75	III-18
18	Program Characteristics as Defined by Provisions of the Act	III-19
19	Performance Objective Type by Program	III-21
20	Measurement of Performance Objectives	III-22
21	Degree of Objectives Success	III-23

TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table		*Page*
22	Reasons for Funding Denial, FY 74	III-24
23	Reasons for Funding Denial, FY 75	III-24
24	IEA Funding by Part: 1973–1976	III-25
25	Grade Equivalent Achievement Gains – Reading – for Sampled Districts Based on Standardized Reading Tests – School Year 74–75	III-27
26	Mathematics Average Grade Equivalents and Gains Two State Sample, 1974–75	III-28

SECTION I
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 OVERVIEW

Indian pupils constitute less than 2 percent of the total school population in the United States and are a minority of the school population within each State; nevertheless, the issue of Indian Education is national in dimension.

About 70% of the Indian school-age children are residents of eight States: Alaska, Arizona, California, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Washington. However, there are 27 other states in which up to 1,000 Indian pupils reside. The diverse geographic areas in which these students live is one of the numerous factors bearing on their educational needs. Other factors are urban vs. rural needs, reservation vs. non-reservation Indian needs.

An estimated 326,354 Indian children and youths attend public schools; 48,000 are enrolled in Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools; and approximately 9,000 attend private or mission schools.

The educational achievement of these students is currently restricted as compared to their non-Indian peers. For example: only 50% complete secondary school; only 17% of the eligible 18-year-old Indian population attend college as opposed to the 38% of the general 18-year-old population; and approximately 4% of those Indians who do enroll in college will actually graduate.

Indian children come from typically poor environmental conditions; family income is poor; their parents' educational attainment is low; and disability from mental and physical difficulties is high.

The poor academic success of these Indian children can be attributed to a number of factors.* Among these factors are:

- Success in school depends upon proficiency in reading. Indian pupils perform consistently well on nonverbal tests but underachieve on standardized tests based on measures of verbal ability.
- Conflict between the social priorities and cultural values of the Indian community and the school system place the Indian child between two opposing forces.
- The poverty and limited education of many Indian parents limit their capacity to participate in and reinforce their children's learning processes.
- Educational needs of Indian children are not always understood by public school teachers and program planners. There are not enough Indian educators and education administrators to fill the demand for their services.
- Tests and grading standards used by many schools do not accurately chart the skills and knowledge the Indian child possesses or has built upon.
- The social conditions of many children are deficient in terms of health care and social welfare services.

**Joint USOE/BIA Study, Executive summary. Office of Education/Office of Indian Education.*

In recognition of the special educational needs of American Indians and Alaskan Natives, the Congress passed the Indian Education Act of 1972* (P.L. 92-318, Title IV) authorizing the U. S. Commissioner of Education to operate a wide variety of programs including supplementary education services, model experiments, demonstrations, and dissemination activities.

Federal assistance provided under the Act is in addition to those funds which may benefit Indians and Alaskan Natives from other U. S. Office of Education (USOE) programs such as School Aid to Federally Affected Areas, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Head Start and Follow Through, the Teacher Corps, Adult Education, and Emergency School Aid.

The Indian Education Act of 1972 addresses the public elementary and secondary education of Indian children and, to some extent, adult education. It contains five parts: (a) financial assistance to public school districts and schools on or near reservations, (b) funding for planning, pilot, and demonstration projects, (c) funding of adult education projects, primarily in the area of literacy and high school equivalency, (d) establishment of the National Advisory Council on Indian Education and the Office of Indian Education, and (e) a set-aside under the Education Professions Development Act for the training of Indian teachers.

The Education Amendments of 1974 broaden the training program for teachers of Indian children, placing it under IEA. They also create a fellowship program for Indian students in engineering, medicine, law, business, and forestry and related fields, at the professional or graduate level.

In terms of academic curricula the Indian Education Act of 1972 contains provision for cultural enrichment programs, supplemental academic courses in reading, mathematics, etc., development of teacher training programs, enhancement of Indians' self-concept, provision or expansion of counseling and guidance for Indians, vocational training of Indian students, and attempted solutions to health problems affecting education of Indians, among others.

Parent committees, school personnel, and Indian communities strongly support the continuation, further development, and expansion of the Indian Education Act.

Indian people, Indian communities, and Indian educators recognize the precedent set for Indian control by the IEA legislation as a major step toward self-determination. The long overdue involvement of Indian people in Indian education is mandated by the Act. It has now become important that the education of Indian pupils be closely related to, and largely determined by, Indian people.

The new awareness of the Federal Government of the need for changes in curriculum, attitudes, teaching techniques and relevant materials, as evidenced by the enactment of the Act, has afforded the opportunity to address the special needs of Indian pupils in public schools. The already growing Indian interest in the education of Indian children has been intensified and expanded by the intent of the law and by the requirement for Indian involvement.

Relevant Indian education shaped by Indian participation in determining program focus, identifying staff, selecting activities, and evaluating the effectiveness of the project is the main thrust of the Act. It is the only legislation within USOE which permits delving into the areas of Indian culture, in addition to standard academic tradition, in order to reinforce pride in Indian heritage and to create a more worthwhile relationship between the Indian child and the school system in which he or she learns.

2.0 CONCLUSIONS

The following major conclusions have been generated from the analysis of available data related to the 3 year progress of the IEA program.

**Also referred to in this report as IEA, the Act, or Title IV.*

2.1 There is evidence to suggest IEA projects are effectively meeting the needs of the students. Field study data, together with the analysis of a sample of pupil achievement results, indicate that Indian children who are participating in these projects are making gains academically, and are exhibiting positive changes in their social behavior patterns and Indian cultural concerns.

2.2 The Indian community and Indians within the school system, particularly the parent committees, are increasing the scope of their involvement in all phases of the projects, including needs assessment, planning, operation, and evaluation. There is, however, a wide range of communication problems between the school administration and the Indian community. This situation indicates a need for more involvement of school administration and Indian community at the level of standardizing terminology and concepts for mutual understanding.

2.3 Realistic programs and policies are being designed and implemented around Indians' special educational needs, thus indicating that efforts are being made to fit the school system to the specific needs of the Indian children, rather than the children to the system, as formerly conceived. For example, there has been increasing emphasis placed on social motivation programs and academic achievement through motivation and attitude changes.

2.4 Although evidence does exist in support of pupil academic achievement, objective test score data is still relatively nonexistent. In addition, where such hard data is available, the use of a variety of testing instruments and test score interpretation militates against the aggregation of these scores into an overall summary which could reflect achievement across the program as a whole. Those projects which did provide achievement data indicate appropriate gains.

2.5 The evidence also suggests that attempts to evaluate IEA projects on a nationwide basis continue to be hindered by:

a. the individuality of the funded projects, making evaluative criteria unclear;

b. the inability to identify efficient unbiased outcome measures which can be administered by agencies external to the projects;

c. the absence of methods of standardized terminology and uniform descriptions of project processes;

d. the inability of Federal staff to agree upon the purpose of evaluation and to generate a priority structure to their policy questions;

e. the difference in school facilities and school years (both duration and starting dates);

f. the paucity of trained evaluation staff in the projects;

g. the loss of both time and data due to population mobility and inadequate data storage or subject tracking procedures.

2.6 There is a need for the design and implementation of a national assessment of programs and projects funded under Title IV. This study should address the following major areas of concern:

a. the collection and analysis of data in support of planning, in terms of recommended changes in program documentation, program implementation, and grant administration.

b. the feasibility of impact evaluations at the pupil level, including data collection methodologies, and instrumentation.

c. the measurement of program/project effectiveness in implementing stated goals and objectives.

d. the review of legislation related to the educational needs of Native Americans with a view toward the generation of a more uniform approach in meeting the needs of this target population.

2.7 There is a continuing need for technical assistance, as well as some type of project information exchange among Title IV projects – a network of dissemination of project descriptions which would be available to all Title IV projects. With the provision of technical assistance and the delivery of information needed by projects, perceptions of school system personnel and local Indian community membership regarding the quality of Indian education will be strengthened to an even higher degree than at present.

3.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Develop and implement a service and dissemination network to implement the findings of pilot, planning, and demonstration projects in the school systems. This will include identifying successful educational practices in projects under Part A and Part B of the Act which can then be replicated as models for implementation under Part A. (For a description of Parts A and B, see page II-1.)

3.2 Continue to support and encourage the recruitment, training, and placement of Indian teachers and administrators for districts that have Indian pupil enrollment.

3.3 Consideration should be given to extend the potential benefits of the Act more broadly to Indian children and youth not now reached, while seeking to target current levels of support effectively on those numbers of pupils who are served.

3.4 To insure full participation of the Indian community in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of Part A local education agency (LEA) projects, a management reporting system should be instituted in which Indian parent committees will reveiw and report on the management of LEA grants. In addition, provision should be made to distribute informational materials to parent committees related to the planning, development, and operation of programs under Part A.

3.5 To develop an information base for identifying Indian educational needs as influenced by the total educational environment, a national needs assessment study should be designed and implemented. This study should not only address needs, but also the alternative ways for meeting those needs and the costs associated with them.

3.6 Develop and implement more extensive delivery of technical assistance at all levels of IEA projects. In this regard, priority should be placed upon program management and evaluation practices, as well as communication/reporting techniques and procedures. This technical assistance could be realized by establishing a process for providing grant recipients intensive management and evaluation training emphasizing the particular provisions of the Indian Education Act and their implications with respect to evaluation. These project personnel would then provide data to be used in the program decisionmaking process via a standardized reporting system for data collection and aggregation.

SECTION II
REVIEW OF FIRST AND SECOND YEARS OF PROGRESS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In recognition of the special educational needs of American Indians and Alaskan Natives, the Congress passed the Indian Education Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-318, Title IV) authorizing the U. S. Commissioner of Education to operate a wide variety of programs including supplementary education services, experiments, demonstrations, and dissemination activities. In keeping with a policy of Indian self-determination, parental and community participation in program development and implementation is required for all projects.

Through its service, demonstration and training activities under the Indian Education Act, the Office of Education strives to assist the educational system in strengthening its capacity to provide an effective education for Indian students. Federal assistance provided under the Act is supplementary to those funds intended to benefit Native Americans from other Office of Education programs such as Impact Aid (P.L. 874), services to educationally deprived children (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I), and education for the handicapped, as well as education programs administered by other Federal agencies such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Indian Education Act funds are used to complement these services and to initiate benefits in areas of unmet need.

The Act has five basic provisions.

Part A: Amends P.L. No. 874 to permit grants to be made to local education agencies (LEA's) for the purpose of developing special educational programs to meet the special education needs of Indian pupils in elementary and secondary schools.

Part B: Amends Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects for improving educational opportunitites for Indian children, including the training of teachers of Indian pupils and the dissemination of information concerning exemplary educational practices.

Part C: Amends Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966 to provide grants to State and local educational agencies, and to Indian tribes, institutions, and organizations, to improve educational opportunities for adult Indians.

Part D: Establishes in the U. S. Office of Education an Office of Indian Education under a Deputy Commissioner of Indian Education. Part D also provides for a new national advisory committee of Indians to be appointed by the President to advise on all matters concerning Indian education.

Part E: Amends Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to dedicate 5 percent of appropriated funds to the preparation of teachers for Indian children, with preference granted the preparation of Indian teachers. Also amends ESEA to permit the U. S. Commissioner of Education to designate certain schools on or near reservations to be classified as "local education agencies" for purposes of the Act.

2.0 SUMMARY OF REPORT ON FIRST YEAR OF PROGRESS

2.1 Overview

In the fiscal year 1973, many eligible districts and organizations did not apply for funding because of time constraints caused by the late release of impounded funds.

Under Part A, 435 LEA's were funded. These districts included 59 percent of all enrolled Indian pupils in the 2565 eligible districts. These LEA's, located throughout 31 States, were awarded nearly $11 million.

Ten Indian-controlled school districts located on or near reservations in seven States received awards totaling $547,618 under the 5 percent set-aside provision of the Act for such districts.

Part B grant awards for $5 million were made to 51 Indian tribes and organizations, as well as to State and local education agencies. These grants were for planning, model and demonstration projects in such areas as bilingual-bicultural education, compensatory education, cultural enrichment, dropout prevention, and vocational training. (21 States)

Under Part C of the Act, 10 grants were awarded for Indian adult education in the amount of $500,000. Nine States had Part C projects approved.

In general, the needs identified by funded districts were reflective of the special educational needs of local communities. A majority of the grantees under Parts A and B designed their projects to attempt to meet the most compelling of these needs. Overall, the proposed expenditures made during this first year were reasonably consistent with the proposed objectives, with some exceptions, especially in the area of staff development.

2.2 Restatement of Fiscal Year 1973 Recommendations

Four major considerations emerged from data collected on the first year of operation of Title IV projects which relate to possible top-level administrative action to increase the effectiveness of the Act.

These considerations were:

1. Make provision for technical assistance to local school districts in the area of program development and evaluation.

2. Make provisions for research grants to cover three key areas:

   a. Financing and targeting of special programs

   b. Developing teaching methods and techniques for use by both Indian and non-Indian teachers in teaching basic skills and cultural heritage to Indian students

   c. Developing appropriate instructional materials to be used along with the new methods and techniques

3. Increasing efforts to recruit, train, and place Indian teachers and administrators in public school systems for instructional improvement and cultural enrichment.

4. Expanding the potential benefits of the Act to include:

   a. Preschool children

   b. Districts with fewer than 10 Indian pupils (possibly by combining grants to districts which are close enough geographically to develop interdistrict programs)

   c. Out-of-school youth

2.3 Actions Taken on Fiscal Year 1973 Recommendations

Several activities were undertaken to respond to these recommendations. First, with respect to technical assistance, several projects were undertaken. A series of conferences were held at various strategic locations around the country to provide technical assistance relating to critical areas as identified by Parts A, B, and C grantees. Topics discussed at these conferences included rules and regulations, role of the parent committees, educational evaluation of projects and funding criteria under the various provisions of IEA. Additionally, a project was initiated to develop a media kit for parent committee members dealing with the primary educational and administrative issues confronting them in the conduct of their responsibilities.

The recommendation relating to the provisions for grants in certain areas was partially implemented by completely revising and expanding the rules and regulations for Parts B and C of the Act to include a substantial priority list for applicants to respond to. These priorities included and emphasized provisions for early childhood education, teaching methodology, and the development of instructional materials and techniques. A study, *The Impact of Federal Funds on Local Educational Agencies Enrolling Indian Children*, was also undertaken and completed. This effort included an extensive analysis of the financing of Indian education at the local level.

Efforts to recruit, train, and place Indian teachers and administrators in the public school system were hampered by the lack of available funding for the teacher training provisions of IEA. However, one of the priorities developed for the Part B regulations and suggested in the fiscal year 1976 budget was a teacher training component, and a substantial, but certainly inadequate, number of projects will be funded from this budget.

Expansion of the potential benefits of the Act to include preschool children and a wider range of eligibility for districts and out-of-school youth were not possible in the one-year period between the first progress report and the second. This was because developing and promulgating recommendations for legislative change is a lengthy and difficult process and generally takes longer than the time available between these two reports. However, planning efforts for legislative changes have been initiated and these activities will be vigorously pursued.

3.0 SUMMARY OF REPORT ON SECOND YEAR OF PROGRESS

3.1 Overview

The latest count of Indian children who were enrolled in public schools was 334,495, an increase of 57% from the 1973–74 school year. Of the total enrollment, 212,938 were receiving services under Title IV as a result of a Part A grant to their school districts. This meant that 121,587 Indian children in public school were not given the opportunity to benefit from Title IV programs. The grant amount varied among funded school districts. For example, in 1974 the range of per pupil expenditure in Title IV projects varied from $74 in Alabama to $195 in New York. Fifty percent of the grants funded were under $10,000; 18.9% ranged from $20,000 to $49,999.

To insure continued progress in the Title IV projects, a National Program Monitoring and Program Evaluation System was being designed to draw from local evaluations. To promote improvement of

field evaluation processes a series of three 5-day Quality Control Conferences and ten 3-day Field Capability Improvement Conferences were held. The conference participants identified the following technical assistance needs:

1. information about how to interpret Federal regulations, Office of Indian Education application and reporting requirements;

2. advice concerning evaluation skills and services;

3. advice on curriculum development and materials.

The results of the field study indicated the following:

- Regarding the effectiveness of project operations, 90% of the project directors rated their project as very effective in some ways; 50% rated the program as very effective in most aspects; 6% rated their project ineffective.

- As to whether the projects were properly targeted, of the 93% of the project directors who responded, 60% gave a definite *yes*, 33% gave a guarded reply, one director replied *no*. Parent committee members responded 54% yes, 28% guarded, and 6% no responses.

- Cost effectiveness information indicated that increases in funding levels provided for appeared to raise the level of program effectiveness.

3.2 Major Conclusions

1. The projects appear to be addressing the needs of the Indian community and although the early proposals had problems of rapport with the community, the projects in operation after the second year seem to be acquiring community support.

2. To date there is strong evidence to suggest project effectiveness.

3. There are severe communication problems between the school administration and the Indian community. This indicates a need for more involvement of school administration and Indian community at the level of standardizing terminology and concepts for mutual understanding.

4. Financial support appears to be best spent in the area of special staff.

3.3 Recommended Administrative Actions

The following possible administrative actions were proposed in the FY 74 Progress Report:

1. Plan and implement action to improve communication, both horizontally and vertically, among all people involved in Title IV. (Field study data shows that 14 percent of parent committees and 19 percent of the project directors identified lack of communication as a major problem.)

2. Develop and implement immediate delivery of technical assistance to projects at all levels of functions of IEA projects. Technical assistance needs of parent committees, project directors and school administrators in the areas of communication, program management, budget, application, reporting, specialized staffing, curriculum and materials development, and evaluation are vital to improved project efficiency at this time.

3. Support and encourage the recruitment, training, and placement of teachers and administrators for districts that have Indian pupil enrollment.

4. Develop an information dissemination center, where services are available to everyone about the Title IV projects. This should include basic information about project goals, objectives, and activities so that information about successful activities can be shared.

5. Extend the potential benefits of the Act to include preschool children, and out-of-school youth and allow for interdistrict programs for districts with fewer than 10 Indian pupils.

3.4 Actions Taken on Fiscal Year 1974 Recommendations

1. Four national conferences were held by the Office of Indian Education (OIE) at strategic locations to provide additional technical assistance in application preparation. However, the primary focus was on upgrading the quality of projects.

2. OIE initiated the development of program informational materials for dissemination to Indian parent committees and other concerned groups.

3. OIE initiated the design and development of a National Program Monitoring and Program Evaluation System whose major thrust is directed toward the utilization of local evaluations.

4. OIE initiated the identification of projects with high potential for success for the purpose of disseminating these "models" to program participants.

5. In order to define the Federal Government's role in Indian Education to be used in formulating a set of legislative and administrative recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of funds from the many Federal education programs intended to benefit Indian children, several studies have been undertaken to define that role. These studies include: a position paper defining the treaty and legislative basis for Federal support to Indian Education; analyses of the current structure, administration, and data flow for the 44 Office of Education programs supporting Indian education; and a joint Bureau of Indian Affairs/Office of Education study of Federal funds supporting Indian education.

SECTION III
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This section addresses several major issues, in the form of questions/answers, related to the progress and effectiveness of the IEA Program. The analysis of the available data utilized to answer these questions provides readers of this report with a detailed exposition of the trends currently existing with the program on a national level.

These major issues are delineated as follows:

I To what extent have Indian children received IEA services?

II Are IEA services addressed to the special educational needs of participating Indian children?

III What educational impact is associated with IEA services for Indian children?

Each of these major issues, in turn, has been divided into several levels of policy question/answers. This approach, used in both the analysis of the data and the reporting of same, provides a more detailed examination of the issues, and offers the reader a more logical presentation/discussion of the findings.

The data subjected to analysis were extracted from the following sources.

- **Project Applications:** FY 75 Title IV Project Proposals submitted to USOE – Office of Indian Education in order to obtain funds to implement programs.
- **Final Evaluation Reports:** FY 75 project documentation submitted to USOE – Office of Indian Education – containing evaluative data of both a descriptive and statistical nature on program/pupil progress and achievement.
- **Special Report of the Indian Education Program Monitoring and Evaluation System, Contract No. OEC-73-7058:** Product generated under contract (June 1973) by CPI Associates, Inc., for the Office of Indian Education; this document constitutes a special report on the development of a monitoring and evaluation system for the Indian Education Program.
- **Summary Report of the Indian Education Project, Monitoring and Process Evaluation System, Contract No. OEC-73-7058:** Product generated under contract (June 1973) by CPI Associates, Inc., for the Office of Indian Education.
- **Technical Report (Draft), Contract No. OEC-73-7058:** Product generated by CPI Associates, Inc., for the Office of Indian Education; this document constitutes the draft presentation of CPI's findings related to the collection and analysis of data related to Indian education and the development of a monitoring and evaluation system for OIE usage.
- **Justifications of Appropriations Estimates for Committee on Appropriations FY 76 and FY 77**

2.0 MAJOR ISSUES

2.1 To What Extent Have Indian Children Received IEA Services?

2.1.1 Project Funding

Table 1 provides a comparative overview of the amounts of Federal monies allocated to Title IV of the Indian Education Act of 1972 since its first year of funding.

TABLE 1
COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW
BUDGET SUMMARY
TITLE IV IEA PROGRAM

	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76
ADMINISTRATION				
S & E (Salary and Expenses)	$170,000	$954,000	$1,286,500	$1,365,800
P & E (Planning and Evaluation)	400,000	645,000	510,000	450,000
NACIE (National Advisory Council on Indian Education)	150,000	160,000	237,500	239,200
PART A				
LEA (Local Education Agency)	11,000,000	23,809,524	22,727,273	31,818,182
Non-LEA (non-Local Education Agency)	547,618	1,190,476	2,272,727	3,181,818
PART B				
	5,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	16,000,000
Fellowships and Teacher Training	0	0	0	*
PART C	500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000
TOTAL	$17,767,618	$41,759,000	$42,034,000	$57,055,000

*Amount undetermined and will depend upon number of trainees.

III-2

Table 1 shows that project funding (total dollars allocated) has increased with each fiscal year. The most dramatic increase occurred in the second year of program operation (FY 74) when the funding rose 136% over FY 73. FY 75 enjoyed the least overall increase (0.6%) of any fiscal year to date, with FY 76 reflecting a 36% increase in project funding over the previous year.

Between FY 73 and FY 76, $158,533,998 has been allocated for the Title IV IEA Program. Table 2 provides a comparable analysis of Part A projects from FY 73 to FY 75, indicating increases and/or decreases in project funding, Indian student enrollment, and pupil expenditure by State.

2.1.2 Participant Characteristics

Data on characteristics of IEA project directors in LEA projects indicate that they are predominantly male, non-Indian, and enjoy high levels of education and considerable experience. Background characteristics of IEA project directors in non-LEA projects, however, indicated that more Indians held project director positions. Both educational levels and experience were considerably lower for non-LEA project directors than for LEA project directors. (The profile of non-LEA parent committees and staff appeared to be similar to that found in LEA projects.)

Background characteristics of the staff assigned to projects at the LEA level reveal that the majority are Indian, and are generally approved for their positions by a Board of Education or by an Advisory Committee. Their qualifications are most frequently established by Advisory Committees.

Background characteristics of the target groups served suggest that 84.8% are regularly in school, 7.2% are out of school, and 8% are both in and out of school.

Tables 3–5 provide a variety of statistical data for Title IV serviced and nonserviced schools within Part A funded school districts. Nonserviced schools comprise only 25% (approximate) of the total number of schools represented in these figures, which means that approximately 75% of schools within school districts funded under Part A of IEA are actually being serviced.

Certain apparent incongruities in the data presented are attributable to the fact that the statistics presented have been extrapolated from a stratified sampling to reflect the total population (Part A funded districts) with no attempt to adjust for nonresponsiveness.

Table 3 shows clearly that Part A funding under IEA is being directed according to the intent of the law, i.e., toward school districts having significant Indian student populations. The table also indicates, however, that there are Indian students attending nonserviced schools in districts funded under Part A of the Act.

In those schools actually serviced through Title IV Part A funds, 37% of the students were reported to be Indian, while among those schools not serviced through Part A funding 17% of the students were reported to be Indian. These figures show that IEA funding is apparently being directed toward those schools having the greatest concentration of Indian students. They also suggest, however, that there is a need for expansion of IEA funding to include a greater percentage of schools and Indian pupils.

Table 4 presents needs data related to Indian students in school districts receiving funding under Part A of IEA. The data show that in three (neglected and delinquent, medical care, and psychological) of four special target group categories a significant majority of the school districts report that they have Indian students in their IEA serviced schools having needs in the particular category referenced. In the fourth category (migratory), only one quarter of the districts reported such needs concerns among Indians. Within those districts reporting some Indian pupil need in these areas, the percentage of the pupils reflecting the particular need in quesiton was shown to be statistically significant in all four categories.

TABLE 2
COMPARABLE ANALYSIS OF PART A PROJECTS

	FUNDING					INDIAN STUDENT ENROLLMENT					PUPIL EXPENDITURE				
	FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975	1973–74 Percent Increase	1974–75 Percent Increase	FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975	1973–74 Percent Increase	1974–75 Percent Increase	FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975	1973–74 Percent Increase	1974–75 Percent Increase
Alabama	$ 0	$ 32,166	$ 43,304	0%	35	0	433	718	0	66%	$ 0	$ 74	$ 60	0%	-19
Alaska	1,532,978	3,706,936	2,549,414	142%	-31	10,790	18,371	16,148	70	-12%	142	202	158	42%	-22
Arizona	1,440,022	2,284,110	2,129,841	59%	-7	18,808	22,129	26,225	18	19%	77	103	88	35%	-21
Arkansas	0	0	12,052	0%	0	0	0	203	0	0%	0	0	59	0%	0
California	107,716	1,214,932	2,121,843	1026%	75	893	10,390	22,520	1063	117%	121	117	94	-3%	-19
Colorado	47,167	114,093	122,843	140%	8	599	1,025	1,384	71	35%	79	111	89	40%	-20
Connecticut	3,191	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	0
Delaware	0	0	4,981	0%	0	0	0	44	0	0%	0	0	113	0%	0
Florida	14,844	57,610	37,043	288%	-36	190	541	451	185	17%	78	106	82	36%	-23
Georgia	0	1,753	0	0%	0	0	22	0	0	0%	0	80	0	0%	0
Idaho	25,502	82,770	109,561	133%	32	515	1,003	1,624	95	62%	89	83	67	20%	-18
Illinois	14,900	161,326	127,580	983%	-21	1,181	1,250	1,152	6	-8%	13	129	111	923%	-14
Iowa	18,912	60,304	53,400	219%	-11	219	505	570	131	13%	86	110	94	38%	-22
Kansas	13,611	99,440	101,808	631%	2	174	952	1,154	447	21%	78	104	88	34%	-16
Louisana	6,320	308,997	321,092	4789%	4	85	3,011	4,057	3442	35%	74	103	79	38%	-23
Maine	10,588	51,582	44,547	387%	-14	27	520	581	1826	12%	392	99	77	-75%	-23
Maryland	51,888	71,545	125,341	38%	75	527	527	1,152	-0	119%	98	136	109	38%	-20
Masschusetts	0	4,502	16,163	0%	259	0	38	158	0	316%	0	118	102	0%	-14
Michigan	113,917	856,908	1,278,535	652%	49	1,239	6,462	11,883	422	84%	92	133	107	44%	-19
Minnesota	669,757	1,276,468	1,107,204	91%	-13	6,473	8,500	9,970	31	17%	103	150	111	46%	-26
Montana	480,590	894,717	830,389	86%	-7	5,560	8,297	9,186	49	11%	86	108	90	25%	-16

TABLE 2 (Cont'd.)
COMPARABLE ANALYSIS OF PART A PROJECTS

	FUNDING					INDIAN STUDENT ENROLLMENT					PUPIL EXPENDITURE				
	FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975	1973–74 Percent Increase	1974–75 Percent Increase	FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975	1973–74 Percent Increase	1974–75 Percent Increase	FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975	1973–74 Percent Increase	1974–75 Percent Increase
Nebraska	$ 18,791	$ 210,755	$ 99,462	1022%	-53	175	1,580	1,117	803	-29%	$107	$133	$ 89	24%	33
Nevada	15,626	294,618	223,445	1785%	-24	202	2,625	2,528	1200	-4%	77	112	8	45%	-21
New Mexico	1,391,996	1,520,984	1,778,955	38%	-7	19,666	19,937	23,076	1	16%	71	96	77	36%	-20
New York	330,221	662,314	796,545	101%	20	1,911	3,394	5,032	78	48%	173	195	158	13%	-19
North Carolina	813,633	1,145,461	938,183	41%	-18	12,581	13,752	13,460	9	-2%	65	83	70	28%	-16
North Dakota	198,038	371,286	211,332	87%	-43	1,539	3,923	2,761	156	-30%	129	95	77	-27%	-19
Ohio	29,029	37,842	46,525	30%	24	377	363	539	-4	48%	77	104	86	35%	-17
Oklahoma	1,631,982	4,306,360	3,923,162	164%	-9	23,256	50,270	57,313	116	14%	70	86	68	22%	-20
Oregon	0	267,952	266,257	0%	-1	0	2,048	2,530	0	24%	0	131	108	0%	-2
South Carolina	0	4,867	0	0%	-100	0	56	0	0	-100%	0	80	0	0%	0
South Dakota	484,074	825,443	669,770	71%	-20	6,414	8,827	8,542	38	-3%	75	94	77	24%	-17
Texas	0	73,778	27,836	0%	-62	0	798	374	0	-53%	0	92	74	0%	-19
Utah	155,235	263,458	251,602	70%	-5	2,292	2,914	3,480	27	19%	68	90	72	33%	-20
Virginia	0	8,227	20,504	0%	149	0	80	247	0	209%	0	103	83	0%	-19
Washington	669,678	1,418,027	1,580,447	103%	11	8,543	12,170	15,963	86	31%	107	117	99	9%	-15
West Virginia	1,508	3,140	3,514	108%	12	22	34	50	55	47%	69	92	70	35%	-24
Wisconsin	419,251	749,332	850,571	79%	13	4,415	5,761	6,375	30	11%	95	130	120	37%	-22
Wyoming	70,045	94,793	113,216	35%	19	875	743	1,101	-15	48%	80	128	103	59%	-19

Table 2 reveals that most of the individual States which have received funding for those consecutive years have reduced their per pupil expenditures from FY 74 to FY 75 while either maintaining or increasing the population serviced.

III-5

TABLE 3
ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PART A FUNDED DISTRICTS
BASED ON FIELD STUDY DATA

	For Schools Serviced Through IEA Funds		For Schools Not Serviced Through IEA Funds	
	% of districts reflecting characteristics	% of pupils reflecting characteristics	% of districts reflecting characteristics	% of pupils reflecting characteristics
Black	30	14	14	22
Indian	81	37	20	17
Oriental	23	6	7	6
Spanish	35	14	12	13
Other	40	54	15	69

TABLE 4
SPECIAL TARGET GROUPS WITHIN PART A FUNDED DISTRICTS
BASED ON FIELD STUDY DATA

	For Schools Serviced Through IEA Funds		For Schools Not Serviced Through IEA Funds	
	% of districts reporting special target group	% of pupils in special target group	% of districts reporting special target group	% of pupils in special target group
Neglected And Delinquent	64	16	16	16
Migratory	25	14	5	6
Medical Care	65	29	22	20
Psychological	72	13	21	8

Among the districts having schools not serviced by IEA funds, the percentage reporting Indian students with special needs in the four target group categories is relatively low, and among those districts the percentage of Indian students reflecting the needs in question was also relatively low overall. In two categories, however – neglected and delinquent, and medical care – the percentage of Indian pupils (16% and 20%) reflecting need but not receiving service because of attendance at nonserviced schools seems significantly high to warrant expansion and extension of IEA funding to include these pupils.

Table 5 also presents needs-related data that suggest in terms of select characteristics the appropriate direction of IEA Part A funding. In two specific categories, *viz.*, family income and reading level, three-fourths or better of the districts receiving Part A funding report having Indian pupils with special needs in these categories. And among these districts significant percentages of the Indian pupils, 32% and 43% respectively, are reported to have needs in the stated categories.

TABLE 5
SELECT CHARACTERISTICS OF PUPILS FROM PART A FUNDED DISTRICTS BASED ON FIELD STUDY DATA

	For Schools Serviced Through IEA Funds		For Schools Not Serviced Through IEA Funds	
	% of districts reporting select characteristics	% of pupils reflecting select characteristics	% of districts reporting select characteristics	% of pupils reflecting select characteristics
Participants from families with poverty level incomes	75	32	2	13
Pupils reading below grade level	78	43	18	39
Pupils who speak English as a second language	41	29	12	7

Perhaps even more noteworthy, however, is the relatively high percentage of districts (18%) having schools and a high percentage (39%) of Indian pupils within those schools with special needs pertaining to reading and yet not receiving IEA Part A funded servicing. When compared with the comparable figures for schools and pupils receiving IEA Part A servicing, the picture is one of emphasis upon remediation of reading problems with considerable need still remaining to be met in this area.

2.1.3 Parent Committee and Community-At-Large Involvement in IEA Programs – Part A

An essential component of programs funded under the Indian Education Act is the involvement of Indian people. The following tables (field study data) give some insight into the diversity of involvement of the Indian community and Indians within the school systems. Parent committees are not limited to one area of planning, operation, or evaluation of IEA programs, but are involved in numerous areas of all three processes.

TABLE 6
PARENT COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT IN PLANNING IEA PROGRAMS (PART A)

	Percent of Districts
Obtained community input about the needs of Indian school children	83%
Determined which services are more needed than others	82%
Helped in developing the application for funding the program	83%
Approved the application for funding after it was developed	86%
Reviewed nominations for Indian Education Act program staff (e.g., teachers, counselors)	61%
Determined how the budget for this district's IEA program(s) is to be spent	73%
Determined how target schools for this district's IEA program(s) are to be selected	65%
Determined how Indian pupils participating in this district's IEA program(s) are to be selected	74%
Participated in planning IEA program(s) in other ways	34%

TABLE 7
PARENT COMMITTEE INVOLVEMENT IN THE OPERATION OF THE IEA PROGRAMS (PART A)

	Percent of Districts
Selected services to meet the needs of particular pupils or schools	71%
Approved or recommended persons for staff in the IEA program(s)	69%
Worked voluntarily in the IEA program(s)	61%
Worked for pay in the IEA program(s)	38%

TABLE 8
COMMUNITY-AT-LARGE* INVOLVEMENT IN IEA PROGRAMS (PART A)

	Percent of Districts
Volunteer tutors in reading	17%
Volunteer tutors in math	14%
Volunteer helpers in other classroom instructional activities	28%
Volunteer helpers in management (e.g., helping in the lunchroom)	21%
Volunteer helpers in supervision of field trips	60%
Paid classroom aides or similar kind of employees	52%
Participants in planning parent committee activities	65%
Participants in evaluating IEA programs	53%
Participants in other ways	26%

*Parents of Indian Children

The statistical data contained in Tables 6, 7 and 8 suggest that project directors and parents, both parent committee members and the community-at-large, have interaction and communication in planning and implementing their IEA programs. Moreover, the degree of parent participation in the determination and selection of IEA services suggests an awareness on their part to the kinds and types of educational programs needed by individual pupils and schools. At this time, however, available data speaks more to the amount of parental involvement than to the effectiveness of that involvement. Absence of complete data at this time suggests the need for a comprehensive, well-planned and developed needs assessment in order to insure a more effective parental involvement.

The extent of parental involvement in IEA program planning and operation further suggests a movement away from making the Indian child fit the school system and toward making the school program conform to the Indian child's needs. If, indeed, correlation between the program and pupil is increasing, it might very well explain in part the improving attendance rates reported for districts participating in IEA programs.

The apparent sensitivity on the part of parents to the academic needs of their children has generated efforts to establish certain curriculum laws related to Indian education, e.g., special programs for Indians in California and Montana. Indian "desks" have been established in some States at the State level, and more importantly, national leaders on Indian education are surfacing more rapidly.

2.1.4 Eligibility of Schools and Students – Part A

Table 9 presents field study statistical data related to the identification of the individuals and groups responsible for determining the eligibility of both schools and students to participate in IEA Part A programs.

TABLE 9
DETERMINATION OF PUPIL ELIGIBILITY – PART A

	Eligible	
	Schools	Students
Parent committee	28%	23%
Administrative staff	21%	22%
Project director	16%	21%
School board	15%	11%
Parents in general	6%	11%
Teachers	1%	20%
Students	0%	7%
Other	30%	24%

Table 9 again points up the extent to which parents are directly involved in IEA activities, showing that a significant percentage of parents are involved in the determination of both school and student eligibility.

It is interesting to note the extent to which teachers are involved in the determination of student eligibility compared with their involvement in the determination of a school's eligibility. The figures suggest that teacher attention in these matters is channeled principally toward the children themselves, which in turn suggests a recognition of teacher understanding of pupils and pupil needs.

Field study data further suggest that, other than the very fact of being Indian, the greatest single determinant of pupil eligibility is academic deficiency. It also appears that the long years of academic deficiency among Indian children have been caused by low self-concept and an absence of pride in heritage and culture. Programs with a general academic remediation thrust and adjustment activities have been less successful than programs and activities focusing on self-concept and cultural heritage. Parent committees and project directors have judged programs that provide for Indian cultural pride and growth in self-concept to be most successful.

With this in mind, it appears that emphasis should be placed on social motivation programs and academic achievement through motivation and attitude changes.

2.1.5 Community Involvement in IEA Programs – Part B

Although the law does not mandate parental and community involvement in Part B programs in the same way that such involvement is required for Part A programs, field study data does reveal a significant amount of community involvement in Part B programs. Table 10 indicates the extent of this overall involvement while Table 11 indicates in some detail the degree of that involvement which relates to program evaluation.

TABLE 10
LOCAL COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN IEA PROGRAMS – PART B

	Percent of Districts
Participants in planning IEA program activities	66%
Participants in planning community activities	63%
Participants in evaluating IEA program	55%
Paid classroom aides	48%
Volunteer tutors	38%
Participants in other ways	34%

TABLE 11
LOCAL COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN EVALUATING IEA PROGRAMS – PART B

	Percent of Districts
Reviewed the way the IEA program(s) is (are) going	79%
Investigated the suggestions, problems, or complaints made by teachers, parents, or students about the program(s)	73%
Reviewed the way staff members conduct the IEA program(s)	77%
Reviewed budget allocations for the program(s) after the program(s) is (are) in operation	71%
Interviewed parents, teachers, and students about the way the program(s) is (are) going	71%
Reviewed the reports evaluating the program(s) that is (are) submitted by district personnel	59%
Participated in other evaluation activities	39%

2.1.6 Eligibility of Students – Part B

A variety of groups and individuals are involved in the determination of pupil eligibility for participation in IEA Part B programs. It is noteworthy that this extremely important decisionmaking factor of program planning has apparently not been either usurped by or relegated to any single individual or group, but rather that both professional and nonprofessional, and both school-related and non-school-related persons appear to have a significant say in the determination of pupil eligibility, as shown by the percentages in Table 12.

TABLE 12
DETERMINATION OF PUPIL ELIGIBILITY – PART B

	Percent
Parent Committee	21.4
Project Staff	21.4
Project Director	17.9
Tribal Officials	16.1
School District Personnel	10.7
Parents of Indian Children	7.4
Parents in General (includes non-Indian)	3.6
Representatives of Community Organizations	1.8
Consultants	1.8
Others	39.3

Table 13 presents the various factors upon which the determination of pupil eligibility was based. The single most frequent determinant of eligibility was the fact that a student was Indian. Prescinding, however, from that expected determinant, the other determining factors were several and varied, with academic concerns holding a slight edge on all others.

TABLE 13
BASIS FOR DETERMINING PUPIL ELIGIBILITY – PART B

Basis	Percent*
Indian	53.6
Academic Data	14.3
Interest	12.5
Volunteer	7.1
Parent Committee Referral	5.4
Staff Referral	5.4
Community Referral	3.6
Handicaps	3.6
Poverty Indices	1.8

*Percentages indicate a selection of two criteria by project directors.

2.2 Are IEA Services Addressed to the Special Educational Needs of Participating Indian Children?

2.2.1 What Is the Relationship Between Assessed Needs and IEA Program Objectives?

The specific needs for assistance under IEA, as perceived at the local level, are reflected in the percentage of funded project applications expressing those needs during the first 3 years of IEA program funding. These percentages are shown in Table 14.

No consistent pattern of degree of need is reflected from year to year for the principal needs areas, although certain trends seem evident when it is noticed that the same areas retain priority status throughout the 3-year period. Thus, among the three areas most frequently mentioned over the 3-year period, one area (educational needs) showed a steady increase in the frequency with which it was mentioned for Part A and Part C projects, but a steady decrease in frequency of mention for Part B projects; another area (curriculum inadequacies) showed an increase followed by a decrease in the frequency of its mention for Part A projects, a steady decrease in its mention for Part B, and a consistency in its mention for Part C projects; the third area (special services) reflected a steady decrease for Parts A, B, and C.

TABLE 14
PERCENTAGES OF FUNDED PROJECT APPLICATIONS REFLECTING SPECIFIC NEEDS: FY 73, FY 74, AND FY 75

	PART A			PART B		PART C	
	1973	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975
Personal Needs	17%	11%	11%	12%	9%	8%	9%
Conduct	5%	4%	6%	8%	4%	2%	1%
Family Relationships	50%	72%	57%	47%	54%	40%	52%
Social Adjustment	30%	13%	23%	16%	10%	24%	12%
Suicide	0%	7%	10%	16%	7%	20%	8%
Delinquency	6%	1%	1%	11%	8%	5%	8%
Self-Image	0%	0%	2%	3%	14%	0%	17%
Other	8%	2%	0%	2%	3%	0%	3%
Health Needs	1%	3%	2%	6%	3%	3%	1%
Mortality Rate	3%	1%	0%	5%	7%	0%	0%
Alcohol/Drugs	0%	13%	68%	27%	34%	57%	44%
Child Disease	8%	1%	0%	5%	9%	0%	11%
Physical/Medical/Dental	0%	57%	5%	32%	12%	36%	11%
Diet Deficiency	56%	12%	11%	10%	21%	0%	22%
Lack of Preventive Health Measures	22%	8%	15%	19%	16%	7%	11%
Other	11%	9%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%
Community Needs	4%	7%	5%	13%	8%	20%	14%
Unemployment	44%	14%	12%	31%	28%	28%	30%
Intertribal Problems	0%	1%	4%	0%	1%	2%	2%
Income Level	44%	24%	27%	21%	29%	21%	22%
Interracial Problems	0%	12%	7%	9%	10%	8%	6%
Adult Illiteracy	11%	5%	6%	16%	16%	32%	35%
Lack of Money for Education	1%	29%	40%	11%	9%	8%	3%
Geographical Isolation	0%	4%	0%	3%	0%	1%	0%
Other	0%	11%	5%	9%	8%	2%	3%
Educational Needs	19%	20%	21%	18%	14%	14%	18%
Dropout Rate	29%	18%	13%	28%	25%	28%	25%
Low Test Scores	21%	12%	13%	11%	12%	1%	3%
Lack of Success	0%	5%	5%	14%	7%	22%	16%
Low Motivation	0%	17%	17%	14%	13%	12%	12%
Absenteeism	21%	14%	12%	14%	11%	3%	6%
Lack of Basic Skills	0%	8%	21%	11%	20%	32%	34%
Low Grades	29%	26%	19%	11%	12%	1%	4%
Other	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Staff Inadequacies	12%	7%	18%	9%	18%	4%	12%
Understaffed	47%	21%	43%	27%	38%	21%	49%
Lack of Teachers	1%	34%	21%	14%	16%	21%	11%
Lack of Training	6%	19%	15%	37%	31%	42%	24%
Poor Attitudes	8%	4%	2%	8%	3%	0%	2%
Lack of Knowledge	41%	22%	18%	15%	12%	16%	15%
Other	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Facility Inadequacies	9%	13%	9%	8%	14%	9%	11%
Buildings	11%	5%	3%	19%	7%	18%	6%
Equipment	37%	31%	22%	33%	42%	33%	40%
Materials and Supplies	52%	64%	74%	48%	50%	49%	54%
Other	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Curriculum Inadequacies	19%	23%	20%	23%	21%	23%	23%
Language Arts	3%	9%	14%	10%	11%	10%	13%
Literature/English	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Arts and Crafts	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	0%	1%
Non-Indian Music	19%	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Social Studies	0%	2%	2%	4%	2%	4%	2%
English as a 2nd Language	0%	2%	2%	5%	3%	9%	3%
Speech and Drama	1%	0%	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%
Indian Studies	47%	30%	27%	19%	22%	11%	15%
Special Education	2%	2%	1%	4%	1%	0%	0%
Indian Language	0%	5%	6%	11%	11%	8%	4%
Library Education	0%	2%	1%	1%	0%	4%	0%
Physical Education	3%	6%	4%	6%	10%	5%	5%
Science	1%	2%	2%	4%	2%	4%	3%
Remedial Reading	9%	17%	19%	12%	13%	13%	16%
Remedial Math	5%	10%	13%	11%	11%	11%	15%
Vocational	0%	5%	3%	6%	3%	16%	11%
Legal Courses	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	6%	4%
Other	7%	1%	2%	2%	4%	0%	9%
Special Services Inadequacies	19%	15%	14%	14%	13%	20%	16%
Testing Program	6%	8%	4%	5%	5%	5%	1%
School Readiness	1%	0%	2%	0%	16%	0%	3%
Playhouse Theater	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Counseling Program	43%	30%	30%	17%	19%	20%	23%
Tutorial Program	4%	2%	29%	14%	17%	1%	14%
Special Broadcast	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Community Relations	24%	22%	23%	20%	19%	11%	10%
Work Study Program	1%	23%	3%	16%	10%	12%	35%
Recreation	1%	4%	0%	3%	0%	1%	0%
Transportation	10%	8%	8%	16%	12%	16%	13%
Other	0%	3%	1%	9%	3%	33%	0%

The year to year inconsistency of statistics within certain needs areas reflects the developmental nature of a program still in its early stages, while the consistency of priority for specific needs areas in relationship to other areas mentioned reflects an established understanding of needs on the part of those submitting project applications.

Over the same 3-year period, as shown by the data presented in Table 15, the objectives established for funded projects showed a trend of consistency with the priority needs. The three objectives areas mentioned most frequently over the 3-year period were "staff development," "curriculum," and "counseling program development." The curriculum objectives corresponded closely to the curriculum inadequacies needs area, while the counseling program development objective corresponded with a principal sub-area of the special services needs area. Only the most frequently mentioned of the objectives, staff development, did not reflect one of the three most frequently mentioned needs areas, although staff inadequacies did rank near the middle of a priority listing of all needs areas over the 3 years.

In terms of consistency from year to year, only the general objectives area of staff development showed a steady increase in frequency of mention for each succeeding year for Parts A, B, and C. The curriculum objectives area showed a steady decrease in frequency of times mentioned for Parts A and B, but remained consistent for Part C. Counseling program development was relatively consistent in the frequency of its mention as an objective for Part A projects, but showed a steady decrease in its frequency of mention for both Parts B and C.

When individual needs and objectives areas are regarded more closely with respect to the frequency with which certain sub-areas are mentioned both as needs and objectives, there is again a noticeable consistency, pointing to a conclusion that the majority of program objectives are in line with the needs expressed in each project application.

Among the curriculum needs and objectives areas most frequently mentioned each year for Parts A, B, and C funding are "Indian studies," "language arts," and "remedial reading and math." Another curriculum sub-area, "basic skills," while not among the most frequently mentioned over the duration of the program, has shown a noteworthy increase in the frequency of its mention as an objective over the past 2 years. The overall picture derived from the curriculum needs and objectives data presented in Tables 14 and 15 is one of a program directed primarily toward fundamental academic concerns (reading, language, math, and basic skills) and an area of expected special concern for the particular recipients of project funds (Indian Studies).

There is an apparent correlation between the increased concern for remedial programs in reading and math and the priority already noted for staff development as an objective among funded projects. Among the principal concerns noted under staff development, the major concern is shown to be the number of teachers and staff. Because remedial programs demand a low pupil-to-staff ratio, the priority of the increased staff objective would be expected to increase in proportion to the priority of curriculum objectives related to remedial instruction concerns. The increased staff objective would also appear to be in line with the previous year's recommendation that support and encouragement be given to recruiting, placing, and training staff and administrators for projects funded under IEA.

Also correlative with the aforementioned concern for increased staffing is the noticeable jump in FY 75 in the percentage of applications reflecting a need for tutorial programs. That special services need and the expressed need for emphasis on counseling services would definitely tend to increase the need for staff to implement funded tutorial and counseling programs.

Within the counseling program objectives area one matter of apparent increasing concern for project applicants was "family relationships." This concern showed up with increasing frequency as an objective in applications for funding under all three parts of IEA. Coupled with an overall slight decrease in the frequency with which certain more academically oriented objectives were mentioned, it would seem that those preparing project applications are evidencing an increasing awareness of the expansiveness of the educational universe and the relationship between emotional stability and academic progress.

TABLE 15
PERCENT OF FUNDED PROJECT APPLICATIONS REFLECTING SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES
FY 73, FY 74, AND FY 75

	PART A			PART B		PART C	
	1973	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975
Staff Development	14%	38%	37%	36%	42%	27%	35%
To be enlarged	81%	15%	24%	17%	22%	11%	23%
Use tutors	0%	10%	11%	8%	5%	12%	6%
To receive training	19%	9%	7%	15%	17%	11%	12%
Work with specialists	0%	6%	5%	9%	6%	9%	9%
Work with individual counselor	0%	16%	11%	13%	16%	12%	14%
Improve community relations	0%	12%	11%	10%	8%	11%	7%
Employ paraprofessionals	0%	14%	9%	11%	10%	15%	12%
Develop curriculum	0%	17%	15%	16%	15%	20%	16%
Other	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Health Program Development	1%	5%	4%	5%	5%	2%	2%
Nursing service	39%	7%	9%	11%	4%	13%	7%
Dental care	0%	25%	21%	11%	13%	0%	7%
Physical exams	15%	16%	10%	18%	11%	13%	0%
Hygiene/general care	7%	14%	26%	17%	24%	50%	40%
Speech and hearing	27%	15%	16%	11%	12%	0%	7%
Nutrition program	12%	9%	10%	24%	26%	25%	27%
Shots and innoculations	0%	13%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%
Other	0%	0%	9%	0%	10%	0%	13%
Equipment Development	6%	6%	7%	6%	9%	5%	8%
Purchase	91%	97%	93%	78%	93%	79%	96%
Lease	1%	2%	5%	21%	7%	21%	4%
Construction	6%	1%	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Alter/renovate	2%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other							
Physical Plant Development	1%	1%	1%	4%	2%	2%	3%
Purchase	9%	0%	8%	2%	9%	0%	16%
Lease	15%	38%	29%	68%	70%	64%	47%
Construction	9%	17%	63%	2%	21%	18%	37%
Alter/renovate	68%	45%	0%	30%	0%	18%	0%
Other							
Curriculum Objectives	36%	31%	29%	33%	31%	42%	42%
Language arts	9%	9%	11%	9%	10%	7%	8%
Math/remedial	8%	9%	11%	9%	12%	8%	10%
Library science	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Vocational courses	0%	5%	3%	5%	2%	12%	8%
Legal courses	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%	4%	4%
English as a 2nd Language	6%	2%	2%	4%	2%	8%	2%
Basic skills	0%	5%	12%	4%	10%	3%	11%
Arts and crafts	14%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Music (non-Indian)	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Social studies	4%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%	1%
Indian language	3%	4%	5%	9%	10%	7%	3%
Literary arts	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Indian studies	12%	27%	22%	16%	19%	7%	11%
Special education	0%	1%	1%	3%	1%	0%	0%
Career education	9%	4%	7%	4%	2%	7%	9%
Reading/remedial	13%	16%	16%	10%	12%	9%	9%
Speech and drama	0%	1%	1%	2%	0%	1%	0%
Physical education	4%	6%	3%	6%	8%	4%	3%
Science	2%	1%	1%	4%	2%	4%	1%
High school equivalency	0%	1%	0%	3%	3%	14%	17%
Other	14%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%
Counseling Program Development	20%	22%	22%	18%	11%	21%	11%
Social adjustment	29%	10%	20%	19%	14%	23%	18%
Self-image concepts	47%	30%	23%	31%	21%	22%	13%
Handling skills	10%	3%	8%	3%	12%	3%	3%
School attitudes	0%	27%	14%	23%	21%	17%	42%
Improve health	5%	0%	8%	0%	10%	0%	4%
Vocational counseling	0%	13%	1%	11%	0%	26%	3%
Family relationships	8%	7%	27%	13%	23%	10%	16%
Other	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%

The steadily increasing frequency with which "family relationships" has been mentioned as an objective sub-area under the general objective of "counseling program development," and the steadily decreasing frequency with which "self-image concepts" is repeated in the same general area suggest a possible correlation between the two objectives: *viz.*, that there is a definite dependency of mature self-image upon good family relationships, and that the increased emphasis of funded projects upon family relationships has tended to reduce the need for emphasis upon self-image concepts as an objective.

Unlike the steady increase in the frequency with which family relationship concerns are mentioned, or the steady decrease in the mention of "self-image concepts" as an objective, a third seemingly related objectives area under the heading of "counseling program objectives" showed first a decrease then an increase in the frequency with which it was mentioned. This inconsistency within a particular general area of objectives occasionally is repeated elsewhere, as shown in Table 15, and would seem to indicate some degree of uncertainty on the part of project applicants with overall program directions, a factor which should gradually disappear as the program continues to mature.

Within the general needs area designated "educational needs" certain consistencies are noted that point favorably toward successful project impact on participating elementary and secondary pupils. The frequency with which "dropout rate" and "absenteeism" were mentioned as needs areas steadily decreased in Part A and Part B applications, suggesting better attendance patterns for student participants based upon favorable project influence upon those students. A decreasing frequency, perhaps correlative to the foregoing, is also noted in the mention of "low grades" as a need on Part A applications, although this need still retains high priority among those expressed in the "educational needs" area.

A lesser area of concern among project applicants, as determined by the frequency with which it was mentioned as a needs area in funded applications, was the matter of "facility inadequacies." Of these, the area of greatest concern was the need for "materials and supplies" shown with increasing frequency each year for applications under Parts A, B and C. A need for "equipment" was also expressed with some frequency by those who mentioned the "facilities inadequacies" areas at all, although it was mentioned with decreasing frequency among Part A applicants and increasing frequency among applicants for Parts B and C funding. The matter of needs related to "buildings" seems to have been of both little and decreasing concern to most applicants.

In most cases data presented in Tables 14 and 15 are not comparable. The principal exception, however, is the general area of curriculum needs and objectives. Table 16 presents the appropriate data from that area of Tables 14 and 15 in a manner that permits clearer understanding of proposed program objectives in relationship to expressed academic program needs for Part A funded projects.

It will be noted that there was a rather significant average discrepancy (6.9 percentage points) between needs expressed and activities apparently designed to meet those needs in projects funded through Part A of the Act during the first year of the program. That average was reduced to 1.3 and 2.5 percentage points during the second and third years of the program, respectively, indicating a better overall correlation between needs and activities as the program developed.

It must be noted, however, that there are presently insufficient data to enable a more detailed and accurate correlation of project needs, objectives, and activities. This lack of data points up clearly the existing need for more extensive and better developed program evaluative procedures.

TABLE 16
RELATIONSHIP OF CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES TO CURRICULUM NEEDS*

	PART A					
	1973		1974		1975	
	Needs	Objectives	Needs	Objectives	Needs	Objectives
Language arts	3	9	9	9	14	11
Remedial math	5	8	10	9	13	11
Remedial reading	9	13	17	16	19	16
Vocational courses	0	0	5	5	3	3
Library science	0	0	2	1	1	0
Legal courses	0	0	0	0	0	0
English as a second language	0	6	2	2	2	2
Arts and crafts	3	14	3	3	2	1
Non-Indian music	19	0	3	2	1	1
Social studies	0	4	2	2	2	2
Indian studies	47	12	30	27	27	22
Special education	2	0	2	1	1	1
Indian language	0	3	5	4	6	5
Physical education	3	4	6	6	4	3
Science	1	2	2	1	2	1
Speech and drama	1	0	0	1	1	1
Literature/literary arts	0	1	0	1	0	0
Basic skills	*0***	0	*8*	5	*21*	12
Career education +		9		4		7
High school equivalency +		0		1		0
Other	7	14	1	1	2	1

*Expressed in percentages of Program Applications indicating need or objective.

**Basic skills needs percentages are drawn from the *Educational Needs* section of Table 14. As a result, needs column totals in this table may exceed 100%.

+Needs area not included in Table 14.

2.2.2 What Types of Programs Are Provided for Special Projects (Part B)?

In FY 75 there were 16 different types of IEA projects conducted under Part B of the Act. Table 17 represents these types of projects and compares them to FY 74 by number of projects and amount funded.

Table 17 shows that there was a 16% increase in the number of projects funded between FY 74 and FY 75, although the actual dollar amount of funding was only 4% greater during the same period. Two areas "cultural enrichment/tutoring/guidance counseling" and "early childhood" were the areas of primary emphasis over the 2-year period, both in terms of number of projects and total dollar amounts. There were several new areas funded in FY 75 that had not received FY 74 funding, two of which, "local needs" and "materials development," received a considerable portion of the total funds allotted, 22% and 12% respectively. On the other hand, some projects such as "parent training" that received funding in FY 74 were not funded at all in FY 75, while other areas like "curriculum development" and "bilingual" received considerably less funding in FY 75 than FY 74 – 73% less in each instance.

TABLE 17
TYPES OF IEA PROJECTS (PART B)
FY 74/FY 75

Type of Project	Number of Participants	Number of Projects		Amount Funded	
	FY 75	FY 74	FY 75	FY 74	FY 75
Education Planning	2,008		5		$ 241,385
Evaluation and Dissemination	5,440		6		304,375
Curriculum Development	5,279	20	5	$1,674,134	471,177
Materials Development	18,473		16		1,467,167
Bilingual	1,553	15	7	1,501,010	495,814
Handicapped	425	3	2	342,000	351,685
Early Childhood	1,672	17	29	1,453,332	1,973,719
Cultural Enrichment/ Tutoring/ Guidance Counseling	6,724	51	37	3,594,051	2,020,298
Remedial	288		2		163,058
Vocational Education	75		1		50,000
Indian Controlled Schools	26		1		40,000
Local Needs	12,752	7	22	675,000	2,655,929
Technical Assistance			2		255,000
Graduate School	27		2		250,000
Part-time Teacher Aide	617	10	8	1,653,875	877,437
Full-time Undergraduate	47		4		382,956
Parent Training		2		288,350	
Other		10		818,248	
Totals		135	149	$12,000,000	$12,000,000

The data presented in Table 17 suggest first of all that Part B funds are indeed being addressed to specialized projects rather than any single or few general areas; secondly, that those responsible for project approval and funding allocation exhibit a willingness to recognize new and changing project significance from year to year; and thirdly, that there appears to be a willingness to curtail or even eliminate funding in some instances even though such action might possibly be unpopular at the local level, since people generally seem to feel that assistance once received can be expected again without question.

TABLE 18
PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS AS DEFINED BY PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

PART B	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75
1. Pilot Planning, Demonstration			
Funded amount	$2,500,000	$ 6,000,000	$ 3,535,522
No. of Projects	25	67	44
2. Exemplary and Enrichment			
Funded amount	$2,000,000	$ 4,800,000	$ 6,394,710
No. of Projects	20	54	83
3. Personnel Training			
Funded amount	$ 350,000	$ 840,000	$ 1,510,393
No. of Projects	4	10	14
4. Information Dissemination and Evaluation			
Funded amount	$ 150,000	$ 360,000	$ 559,375
No. of Projects	2	4	8
SUBTOTAL – PART B			
Funded amount	$5,000,000	$12,000,000	$12,000,000
No. of Projects	51	135	149
PART C	**FY 73**	**FY 74**	**FY 75**
5. Curriculum and Materials Development			
Funded amount	$ 140,000	$ 1,380,313	$ 217,016
No. of Projects	2	16	3
6. GED and ABE			
Funded amount	$ 260,000	$ 1,187,053	$ 2,514,500*
No. of Projects	5	19	44
7. Survey			
Funded amount	$ 100,000	$ 352,634	$ 198,424
No. of Projects	3	10	4
8. Vocational Counseling and Practical GED			
Funded amount		$ 80,000	$ 70,060
No. of Projects		1	2
SUBTOTAL – PART C			
Funded amount	$ 500,000	$ 3,000,000	$ 3,000,000
No. of Projects	10	46	53
TOTALS			
Funded amount	**$5,500,000**	**$15,000,000**	**$15,000,000**
No. of Projects	**61**	**182**	**202**

*Includes $450,000 for 2 "Cultural with GED" Projects.

The data presented in the foregoing table shows that for both Parts B and C the total number of projects funded increased considerably between FY 73 and FY 74, and then somewhat less dramatically between FY 74 and FY 75. The overall rate of growth was greater each year for Part C than for Part B, 360% vs. 167% and 15% vs. 9% respectively, although the total number of Part C projects was considerably lower over the 3-year period than for Part B: 109 projects vs. 335 projects.

In dollar amounts, however, the picture was somewhat different. Part B funding increased by 140% from FY 73 to FY 74, but then dropped slightly (less than 1%) the following year. Part C funding increased 500% from FY 73 to FY 74 and then remained constant for FY 75.

2.4 What Kinds of Performance Objectives Are Associated With IEA Programs?

Table 19 presents the numbers of project applications reflecting each of four types of program objectives for each program area. The performance objective types, while not completely mutually exclusive, reflect a certain dominant intent that can be defined as follows:

Provisional objectives are those concerned with providing a service that in turn may lead to some further outcome, *e.g.*, the provision of a field trip with cultural implications, the provision of a health examination, etc. The emphasis is on the event rather than the final outcome.

Change oriented objectives are those which are primarily concerned with altering methodology or delivery systems as a means to some further outcome, such as changing the way in which an academic subject is taught in order to improve the pupil's grasp of that subject, *e.g.*, introducing a reading lab situation to replace or supplement a self-contained classroom approach to the teaching of reading.

Mastery type objectives are those directed toward the acquisition of a particular skill or the attainment of a level of academic understanding. They are the type of objectives that readily lend themselves to measurement by standardized testing devices.

Indicator change objectives are those designed to bring about statistical change in social factor indicators of program success, *e.g.*, attendance figures, dropout rates, parental interest, etc.

Table 19 shows that the greatest percentage (65%) of program performance objectives specified in the project applications were considered to be *provisional* type objectives. Only 1% of the objectives were listed as *mastery* objectives. These figures clearly indicate the dearth of program measurement capability especially with regard to academically oriented programs. The need for immediate attention in this area seems obvious. Technical assistance for project directors and program staff in the area of program objectives development and follow-through program evaluation is recommended as one readily implemented remedy for this need. A more long-range approach toward meeting the need might be the establishment of a "national center" in which project participants would receive more intensive training in management and evaluation methodologies and practices, as well as communication/reporting techniques and procedures.

The data presented in Table 19 corroborate the data presented previously in Table 15 regarding program objectives.

Table 20 illustrates how the several types of performance objectives are measured.

Table 20 points up a definite weakness in present IEA assessment techniques, indicating a heavy emphasis on subjective (testimonial) assessment rather than more objective methods of assessment such as testing. In order to provide more comprehensive assessment of the total IEA effort, greater attention will have to be devoted to the matters of objective measurement and program evaluation. These data serve to corroborate the need, mentioned previously in conjunction with Table 19 for a "national center" and the availability of technical assistance to assist program directors with design and evaluation concerns.

TABLE 19
PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE TYPE BY PROGRAM – PART A

Program/Objective Type	Provisional	Change Oriented	Mastery	Indicator Change	No Type Indicated	Total
Language Arts	1*	4	0	0	0	5
English 2nd Language	2	2	0	0	0	4
Indian Language	3	1	0	0	0	4
Reading (Remedial)	9	11	5	0	0	25
Math (Remedial)	4	6	0	0	0	10
General Academic	17	16	0	0	1	34
English Literature	0	0	0	0	0	0
Speech, Drama	0	0	0	0	0	0
Library Science	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arts & Crafts	19	0	0	0	0	19
Indian Studies	38	4	0	1	1	44
Physical Education	9	1	0	0	0	10
Vocational Courses	2	0	0	0	0	2
Music	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Education	1	2	0	0	0	3
Science	0	1	0	0	0	1
Law	1	0	0	0	0	1
Social Studies	2	2	0	0	0	4
Career Education	11	0	0	0	0	11
GED	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Develop.	2	0	0	2	0	4
Physical Plant Develop.	6	0	0	2	0	8
Health Program Develop.	12	0	0	1	0	13
Staff Development	10	7	0	3	0	20
Curriculum Develop.	8	1	0	6	0	15
Social Adjustment	4	3	0	2	0	9
Self-Image	5	11	0	0	0	16
Counseling	26	9	0	7	0	42
Community Involvement	19	6	0	1	0	26
Recreation	7	0	0	0	0	7
TOTALS	218	87	5	25	2	337

*Number of sampled Evaluation Reports indicating type of objective. Sample N = 116.

TABLE 20
MEASUREMENT OF PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES – PART A

Type of Measurement	Provisional Objective	Change Oriented Objective	Mastery Objective	Indicator Change Objective	Total
No Measurement	24*	3	0	0	27
Observation (non-sys.)	9	17	0	1	27
Observation (sys.)	0	3	0	3	6
Attitude Scales	3	2	0	1	6
Questionnaires	8	6	0	0	14
Interviews	4	1	0	1	6
Tests (non-standard)	2	3	1	0	6
Tests (standard)	1	21	3	0	25
Performance Ratings	5	5	0	1	11
Testimonials	110	24	1	3	138
Matter of Record	52	2	0	15	69
TOTALS	218	87	5	25	335

*Number of sampled Evaluation Reports indicating type of measurement. Sample N = 116.

2.5 How Effective Is the Planning and Evaluation Process?

The denial of IEA applications notwithstanding, the following table indicates the degree to which IEA project objectives, which were approved, have been met.

The figures presented in Table 21 show an 84% majority of all respondents indicating program success in terms of stated objectives. According to the same criteria less than 5% indicated failure, and approximately 12% were inconclusive.

The thrust of the evaluations was indicated in the IEA Project applications; 78.4% of the project evaluations were designed to measure educational change, and 56.6% were designed to measure personal and social growth. These evaluations were conducted on the following basis: 41.8% utilized reports and 45% utilized tests.

TABLE 21
DEGREE OF OBJECTIVES SUCCESS – PART A

Objective	Success	Failure	No Results	Total
Language Arts	5*	0	0	5
English 2nd Language	3	1	0	4
Indian Language	4	0	0	4
Reading (Remedial)	17	2	6	25
Math (Remedial)	7	0	3	10
General Academic	25	6	3	34
English Literature	0	0	0	0
Speech, Drama	0	0	0	0
Library Science	0	0	0	0
Arts & Crafts	19	0	0	19
Indian Studies	40	1	3	44
Physical Education	9	0	1	10
Vocational Courses	1	0	1	2
Music	0	0	0	0
Special Education	2	0	1	3
Science	0	0	1	1
Law	1	0	0	1
Social Studies	3	0	1	4
Career Education	11	0	0	11
GED	0	0	0	0
Equipment Development	4	0	0	4
Physical Plant Dev.	8	0	0	8
Health Program Dev.	11	0	2	13
Staff Development	20	0	0	20
Curriculum Development	14	0	1	15
Social Adjustment	8	0	1	9
Self-Image	11	0	5	16
Counseling	34	2	6	42
Community Involvement	21	4	1	26
Recreation	4	0	3	7
TOTAL	282	16	39	337

*Number of sampled Evaluation Reports indicating degree of success. Sample N = 116.

2.6 What Effects Are Associated With the Federal Delivery System?

2.6.1 To What Extent Were Applications Denied?

FY 74/FY 75 applications were denied for a variety of reasons, as illustrated by the following tables:

TABLE 22
REASONS FOR FUNDING DENIAL, FY 74

	Number
Application incomplete	23
Application ineligible	11
Monetary arrangements unacceptable	4
Proposal narrative weak	20
Evaluation/dissemination lacking/vague	30
Indian community involvement low	84
Low priority/not worth funding	2
Other	8
TOTAL	182

TABLE 23
REASONS FOR FUNDING DENIAL, FY 75

Part A	Number
No fiscal control & funding accounting procedures	301
Special education needs not mentioned	293
Nonutilization of talent & resources	237
Parent committee not selected	236
Applicant not eligible LEA	3
Part B	
Indian community & parent involvement unclear	160
Evaluation techniques unclear	156
Implementation plan inadequate	140
No coordination to other related activities	123
Clarification of objectives	112
Part C	
Attainment of objectives unclear	44
Evaluation techniques unclear	31
Objectives unclear	28
Expenditures not clearly stated	28
Indian community involvement unclear	24
TOTAL	1916

Tables 22 and 23 show a number of different reasons for the denial of applications over the FY 74 – FY 75 2-year period. No clear pattern seems to be revealed either for the 2 years or the three Parts of IEA. In terms of overall frequency of mention, the percentage of difference between the reasons most frequently mentioned and those less frequently mentioned is negligible in most cases. The variety of reasons expressed suggests a need for more detailed guidelines/instructions and technical assistance, as required, to assist those who prepare applications at the local level.

2.6.2 What Changes Have Occurred in Funding?

Table 24 illustrates the changes that have occurred in funding between 1973–1976.

TABLE 24
IEA FUNDING BY PART: 1973–1976

PART A – LEA's				
	73 Actual	74 Actual	75 Actual	76 Estimate
No. eligible local school districts	2,565	2,621	3,088	3,200
No. applications received or anticipated	553	1,098	1,169	1,550
No. grants awarded	435	854	845	1,200
No. States in which awards are made	31	36	38	40
Average cost of awards	$25,172	$27,881	$26,896	$26,515
Average grant expenditure per child	$ 81	$ 111	$ 85	$ 107

PART A – NON-LEA's			
	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76
Applications received or expected	35	45	45
Grants awarded or anticipated	23	25	35
Average cost of award	$51,739	$ 90,909	$ 90,909
No. States in which award is made	12	15	20
Average duration of projects	1	1	1
PART B			
No. applications received or expected	438	442	525
No. grants awarded or anticipated	135	149	213
Average cost of award	$88,888	$ 81,081	$ 75,000
No. States in which award is made	25	28	30
Estimated no. of children served	80,000	90,000	120,000
PART C			
No. applications received or expected	110	140	150
No. grants awarded or anticipated	38	53	65
Average cost of award	$78,947	$ 56,604	$ 61,538
No. of States in which awards are made	19	21	25
Estimated no. of adults served	8,000	9,000	15,000
Average duration of projects	1	1	1

The several sections of Table 25 reveal a pattern of more or less steady growth in all areas except the average cost of awards, which showed a steady decrease in every instance save one: the estimated average cost of non-LEA awards for FY 76 vs. FY 75, which shows a projected 1% increase. These patterns corroborate what was suggested previously in subsection 2.3.3.1 concerning the characteristics of IEA services: in spite of apparent budgetary limitations, an increasing number of persons and districts are being serviced by an increasing number of projects and programs.

2.7 What Changes Have Occurred in Pupil Achievement?

In attempting to determine project impact in the cognitive area, it was hoped that collecting data from the multitude of projects would provide the basis for establishing criteria for statistical and educationally significant conclusions. In the process of collecting, categorizing, and classifying the data, however, it became apparent that the variety of tests employed and the variety of methods used for reporting results, linked to the vast number of problems faced when dealing with normative data constructed for different testing intervals, etc., led to the conclusion that any so-called impact evaluation, though reportedly based on hard data could not be looked upon as representing more than inferential results. Difficulties encountered were similar to those reported by Tallmadge and Horst in their attempts to develop guides for validating achievement gains in educational projects.[1]

Another major difficulty encountered was the lack of achievement test data available for most projects which either did not use testing as a means of evaluating progress, or have just begun to implement such methods of validating impact and therefore lack any pre/post comparative data at present.

With these limitations in mind a sample of existing data has been collected and, where possible, summarized.

Reading achievement test data collected from a random sample of school districts across six States and eight different school districts revealed achievement gains of better than 1 year (i.e., 1.0 grade equivalent) in every grade from first to twelfth. The results appear in Table 24. They indicate that the pattern of achievement was fairly consistent whether the individual district concentrated its attention in the lower, middle, or upper grade levels or spanned all levels.

The data presented in Table 25 reflect test scores collected through pre/post administration of the following tests:

District Sample Number	Reading Achievement Test
No. 1	Not identified
No. 2	Metropolitan
No. 3	Nelson
No. 4	Gray Oral
No. 5	Metropolitan
No. 6	Gates-MacGinitie
No. 7	Gates-MacGinitie
No. 8	Iowa Silent Reading

The column in Table 25 which registers the average gains across districts shows an impressive average grade equivalent gain in each grade. It is possible, however, that these data, because of the limitations previously indicated, may not stand up to statistical validation. The impact of the projects upon the Indian students is therefore questionable because measurement methods, as in characteristics of other federally funded programs, are not standardized. While the results apparently do imply acceptable progress, the weakness of methods may lead to some jumping to conclusions regarding program impact. It is strongly recommended that procedural guidelines for validating impact data be prescribed for the projects, and data be collected and reported to OE in a fashion amenable to valid statistical measurement.

[1] A Procedural Guide for Validating Achievement Gains in Educational Projects: G. K. Tallmadge, D. P. Horst; RMC Report 240. Office of Education/Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation; Bethesda, Maryland, Dec. 1975

TABLE 25
GRADE EQUIVALENT ACHIEVEMENT GAINS – READING – FOR SAMPLED DISTRICTS BASED ON STANDARDIZED READING TESTS – SCHOOL YEAR 74–75

Grade	Sampled District																Average G.E.Gain Over All Districts
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		
	N – 73		N – *		N – 645		N – 1162		N – 269		N – 1048		N – 1423		N – 237		
	Number Tested	Average G.E.Gain	Number Tested	Average G.E.Gain	Number Tested	Average G.E.Gain	Number Tested	Average G.E.Gain	Number Tested	Average G.E.Gain	Number Tested	Average G.E.Gain	Number Tested	Average G.E.Gain	Number Tested	Average G.E.Gain	
1	*	0.6											66	0.9			1.1
2	*	1.2					4	1.6	11	0.8	52	1.2	83	1.0			1.2
3	*	0.9					10	1.1	4	0.9	51	1.1					1.3
4	*	0.6	198	1.8	18	1.5	13	0.8	5	0.9	43	1.1					1.3
5	*	1.1			14	1.9	11	1.1	11	0.7							1.5
6	*	0.4			13	1.1	6	2.8	7	0.6							1.4
7	*	2.0															1.8
8	*	1.0	81	1.8													1.6
9															11	2.1	1.9
10															6	1.5	1.6
11			25	1.6											2	1.8	1.6
12															3	1.3	1.5
Total Number Tested / Average Gain For District			304	1.8	45	1.5	44	1.3	38	0.8	146	1.1	149	1.0	22	1.8	1.4

N = Number of Indian students in district.
* No information provided.

Impact data in mathematical achievement were even less available than those on reading achievement, and it was impossible to collect data on a representative sample of districts. Mathematical impact data were collected in two school districts in two States. One district employed the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills and the other employed the Stanford Achievement Test. The comparison of the pre and post test scores reflects acceptable educational gains for Indian students whose initial scores revealed them to be well below expected grade levels.

TABLE 26
MATHEMATICS AVERAGE GRADE EQUIVALENTS AND GAINS
TWO STATE SAMPLE, 1974–75

Grade	N	Pretest	Post Test	Gain
2	11	1.9	2.7	0.8
3	12	2.4	3.4	1.0
4	20	2.7	3.7	1.0
5	53	3.6	4.8	1.2
6	44	4.3	5.3	1.0

Impact of programs on students is not limited to educational achievement gains. Other areas can indicate program effectiveness, such as changes in absenteeism and dropout rates. In one district comparison between documented absenteeism rate of Indian students in 1974–75 and 1973–74 showed a marked improvement following the second year of the project. The second year revealed a mean of 20 days absence per Indian student per year versus a mean of 33 days absence per Indian student per year in 1973–74. There was thus an average 40% reduction in absenteeism in 1974–75. Although documentation was not available for all cases, similar claims for reduced absenteeism were recorded by the majority of project coordinators.

One factor possibly contributing to improving attendance rates might be an increasing correlation between school program and actual pupil needs and interests. Another possible contributing factor could be the degree of parental interest and involvement in both program planning and operation, which is reflected favorably in pupil attitudes that in turn are carried over into attendance patterns.

Documentation of dropout rates of Indian versus non-Indian students continues to reveal a higher dropout rate by the Indian students. Many project coordinators, however, indicated that they were of the opinion that the added services provided to the Indian pupils were helping to keep the dropout rate from climbing even higher.